



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,730	02/13/2002	Randal J. Ramig	13768.243.1	8871
47973	7590	10/04/2005	EXAMINER	
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			PATEL, CHIRAG R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/074,730	RAMIG, RANDAL J.
	Examiner Chirag R. Patel	Art Unit 2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2005.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11, 15-19, 24 and 26-28 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-14, 20-23 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Examiner also notes that claims 12-14, 20-23, and 25 are cancelled by the applicant.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 15 depends on claim 14, which is a cancelled claim. Examiner, for sakes of examination, has assumed it to depend from claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11, 16-19, 24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hovell et al. – hereinafter Hovell (US 2004/0093434) in view of Aziz et al. – hereinafter Aziz (US 6,119,234).

As per claims 1, 24, and 26, Hovell discloses in a requesting computer system that is network

connectable to a network, the requesting computer system including a native host name resolver that is not capable of resolving a host name when the requesting computer system is connected to the network, a method for resolving a host name, comprising the following;

an act of requesting resolution of a host name by sending host name data in a first protocol to the requesting computer by sending the host name data to the name server assigned for the requesting computer, the host name data being compatible for resolution of the host name by a DNS server, the first protocol being incompatible for resolving host name data over a communication link connecting the requesting computer to the network; ([0038] – [0043])

an act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving the host name data in the first protocol from the requesting computer; ([0038] – [0043])

an act of rerouting the host name data in the first protocol to a replacement host name resolver in the requesting computer system; and ([0038] – [0043])

an act of sending the host name data from the replacement host name resolver in the requesting computer system using a second to a module for resolving the host name data; wherein the second protocol is compatible for resolving host name data over the communication link connecting the requesting computer to the network. ([0038] – [0043])

Hovell fails to disclose an act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system. Aziz discloses an act of assigning the

requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system.

(Col 8 lines 26-42) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to assign the requesting computer system as a name server in the disclosure of Hovell. The motivation for doing do would have been to implement a loopback (Col 8 lines 26-42)

As per claim 2, Hovell discloses discloses the method as recited in claim 1.

Hovell fails to disclose loopback address. Aziz discloses wherein the act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system comprises the following: an act of utilizing a loop-back address to assign the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines 26-42) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose a loopback address in the disclosure of Hovell. The motivation for doing do would have been to allow a configuration when it is not desirable or possible to modify a client's resolver. (Col 8 lines 26-42)

As per claim 3, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 2. Hovell fails to disclose the act of utilizing a defined IP loop-back address. Aziz discloses wherein the act of utilizing a loop-back address to assign the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system comprises the following: an act of utilizing a defined IP loop-back address to assign the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines 6-18) At the time the

invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a defined IP loop-back address in the disclosure of Hovell. The motivation for doing do would have been to allow the full resolver functionality to be implemented in one component. (Col 8 lines 19-25)

As per claim 4, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1. Hovell fails to disclose the act of assigning the requesting computer system as the primary name server. Aziz discloses wherein the act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system comprises the following: an act of assigning the requesting computer system as the primary name server for the requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines 26-42) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to assign the requesting computer system as a primary name server. in the disclosure of Hovell. The motivation for doing do would have been to to allow the full resolver functionality to be implemented in one component. (Col 8 lines 19-25)

As per claim 5, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1. Hovell fails to disclose the act of assigning the requesting computer system as a DNS server. Aziz discloses wherein the act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system comprises the following: an act of assigning the requesting computer system as a DNS server for the requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines 26-42) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art to assign the requesting computer system as a DNS server in the disclosure of Hovell. The motivation for doing do would have been to to allow the full resolver functionality to be implemented in one component. (Col 8 lines 19-25)

As per claim 6, Hovell/ Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell discloses wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving the host name data in the first protocol resolution comprises the following: an act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system that is associated with an IP network. ([0040])

As per claim 7, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 6, and Hovell discloses wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system that is associated with an IP network comprises the following: an act of monitoring port 53 of the requesting computer system. ([0040], Port 53 is inherent to the DNS system because it is the default DNS port.)

As per claim 8, Hovell/ Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell discloses wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving the host name data in a host name resolution protocol comprises the following: an act of monitoring a name resolution port for receiving host

name data in a host name resolution protocol that is compatible with an IP network.  
([0038]; IP v6/v4)

As per claim 9, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell discloses wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port for receiving the host name data in a host name resolution protocol that is compatible with an IP network comprises the following: act of monitoring a name resolution port for host name data contained in one or more UDP packets. ([0060], UDP is inherent to the TCP/IP protocol stack)

As per claim 10, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell discloses wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving the host name data in the first protocol comprises the following: an act of a replacement host name resolver monitoring a name resolution port for receiving host name data sent from a native host name resolver. ([0068])

As per claim 11, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving the name data in the first protocol comprises the following: an act of a resolving computer system monitoring a name resolution port for receiving host name data sent from a native host name resolver. ([0068])

As per claim 16, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell discloses wherein the first protocol is DNS and the second protocol is secure DNS. ([0063]; IPSEC)

As per claim 17, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell discloses wherein the act of sending the host name data from the replacement host name resolver in the requesting computer system using a second protocol to a module for resolving the host name data comprises the following:

an act of the of a replacement host name resolver rerouting the host name data to a module that was identified by entering one or more parameters in a user interface; ([0043] – [0046])

As per claim 18, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: an act of providing the requesting computer system with a network address by resolving the host name data that was sent to the module. ([0043] – [0046])

As per claim 19, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 18, wherein the act of providing the requesting computer system with a network address by resolving the host name data that was sent to the module comprises the following:

providing the requesting computer system with a numerical IP address by resolving a domain name that was sent to the module. ([0043] – [0046])

As per claim 27, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 26, and Hovell discloses wherein the one or more computer-readable media include physical storage media. ([0082])

As per claim 28, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 26, and Hovell discloses wherein the one or more computer-readable media include system memory. ([0083])

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hovell (US 2004/0093434) / Aziz (US 6,119,234) in view of Onweller (5,799,016)

As per claim 15, Hovell/ Aziz discloses the method as recited in claim 1 (please see note above under claim objections), and Hovell fails to disclose the first protocol is UDP and the second protocol is TCP. Onweller discloses wherein the first protocol is UDP and the second protocol is TCP. (Col 9 lines 39-62) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose the first protocol is UDP and the second protocol is TCP in the disclosure of Hovell. The motivation for doing do would have been to support communication with standard that use different standards. (Col 9 lines 39-62; capable of translating between the tcp/ip, udp/ip)

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. These references are disclosed in the Notices of References cited page and teach numerous methods of resolving host name data. A close review of these references is recommended.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R. Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairdirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).



RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER